

REMARKS

This Amendment is responsive to the Office Action identified above, and is further responsive in any other manner indicated below.

PENDING CLAIMS

Claims 1-5 were pending, under consideration and subjected to examination in the Office Action. Appropriate claims have been amended, canceled and/or added (without prejudice or disclaimer) in order to adjust a clarity and/or focus of Applicant's claimed invention. That is, such changes are unrelated to any prior art or scope adjustment, and are simply refocused claims in which Applicant is present interested. At entry of this paper, Claims 1-5 will remain pending for further consideration and examination in the application.

REJECTION UNDER 35 USC '103

The 35 USC '103 rejection of claims 1-5 as being unpatentable over Huck (U.S. Patent 6,985,576) in view of Mayer et al. is respectfully traversed. However, such rejections have been rendered obsolete by the present clarifying amendments to Applicant's claims, and accordingly, traversal arguments are not appropriate at this time. However, Applicant respectfully submits the following to preclude renewal of any such rejections against Applicant's clarified claims.

All descriptions of Applicant's disclosed and claimed invention, and all descriptions and rebuttal arguments regarding the applied prior art, as previously submitted by Applicant in any form, are repeated and incorporated hereat by reference. Further, all Office Action statements regarding the prior art rejections are

respectfully traversed. As additional arguments, Applicant respectfully submits the following.

More particularly, Applicant's disclosed and claimed invention is directed toward telephony (e.g., repeater, telephone, router, program) arrangements, enabling connection to telephones (existing on a LAN network) without a caller-side telephone having to specify the address of a receiver-side telephone unit. By not having the requirement of having to specify the address of the receiver-side telephone, cheaper and/or less complex telephony arrangements may be constructed. Applicant's invention facilitates the connection, basically by polling potential receiver-side telephones whenever there is a call to be connected, to see which ones of the receiver-side telephones is presently operationally capable of receiving the call. Applicant's invention then selects one of receiver-side telephones as a selected phone, and **then notifies the caller-side telephone of the address of the selected receiver-side telephone unit to which the incoming call is to be generated, at a timing before the incoming call to the receiver side telephone unit is generated.** The caller-side telephone, using the address of the selected receiver-side telephone, may thereafter initiate operations towards completion of connection of the incoming call to the selected phone.

In terms of distinguishing claim language, independent claim 1, for example, recites, "a function for **selecting, out of the plurality of receiver-side telephones that responded, a receiver side telephone unit to which the incoming call is to be connected,** and a function for **notifying the caller-side telephone of the address of the selected receiver-side telephone unit to which the incoming call is to be generated, before the incoming call to the receiver side telephone unit**

is generated.” Other ones of Applicant’s claims have similar or analogous features/limitations.

Turning now to preclusion of the applied art, Office Action comments (Detailed Action page 3) admit that Huck is deficient, in that Huck “...does not teach a function for notifying the address of the selected receiver-side telephone to a caller-side telephone.” The Office Action attempts to cure such deficiency by relying upon Mayer et al. as a secondary reference. However, it is respectfully submitted that there is no suggestion or motivation provided by such references themselves to combine the same, and even assuming *arguendo* that there is suggestion or motivation to combine, such combination still would not have resulted in or suggested Applicant’s invention.

More particularly, it is respectfully submitted that Huck already selects its own “responding agent” (assume this means the “address” of a “receiver-side telephone”), and because of such selection, Huck’s system already knows “address” information (e.g., including email address, cookies, URL address, IP address (col. 8, lines 52-56)). That is, Huck’s system keeps a meticulous database (names, addresses, telephone numbers) on its “responding agents” (e.g., sales agents, technical support agents, etc.), i.e., well beyond any information that a “caller-ID” type of arrangement (like Mayer et al.’s) might provide. Regarding a “geographical address”, Huck teaches (col. 3, lines 32-39) that it has no concern with geographical addresses because inexpensive Internet telephony is being used.

Because Huck’s system already keeps meticulous database records on its “responding agents” (i.e., possible receiver telephones), it is respectfully submitted that there would be no, and even negative, incentive to incorporate Mayer et al.’s

“caller-ID” type arrangement into Huck’s system, i.e., very little, if any, new information would be obtained, at significant additional expense.

Further, even assuming *arguendo* that there was suggestion or motivation to combine Huck and Mayer *et al.*, it is respectfully submitted that combination still would not have resulted in or suggested Applicant’s invention. More particularly, it is respectfully noted that Mayer *et al.*’s arrangement provides “caller-ID” type information **AFTER a call is generated** (i.e., initiated). That is, Mayer *et al.*’s arrangement takes advantage of the “holding interval” (while the call connects) to provide Mayer *et al.*’s information. In contrast, it is respectfully noted that Applicant’s disclosed and claimed invention provides Applicant’s “address” (regarding the selected receiver-side telephone) **BEFORE call generation** (i.e., initiation). Remember that the purpose of Applicant’s “address” is to tell the caller-side telephone know of **WHERE TO PLACE THE CALL**. Regarding claim limitations, again, Applicant’s claims recite: **“notifying the caller-side telephone of the address of the selected receiver-side telephone unit to which the incoming call is to be generated, BEFORE the incoming call to the receiver side telephone unit is generated.”** It is respectfully noted that neither Huck, nor Mayer *et al.*, taken alone or together in combination, teach or suggest such feature/limitations.

As a result of all of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the applied art would not support a ‘103 rejection of Applicant’s claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of such ‘103 rejection, and express written allowance of all of the ‘103 rejected claims, are respectfully requested.

RESERVATION OF RIGHTS

It is respectfully submitted that any and all claim amendments and/or cancellations submitted within this paper and throughout prosecution of the present application are without prejudice or disclaimer of any scope or subject matter. Further, Applicant respectfully reserves all rights to file subsequent related application(s) (including reissue applications) directed to any/all previously claimed limitations/features which have been subsequently amended or cancelled, or to any/all limitations/features not yet claimed, *i.e.*, Applicant continues (indefinitely) to maintain no intention or desire to dedicate or surrender any limitations/features of subject matter of the present application to the public.

EXAMINER INVITED TO TELEPHONE

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the local D.C. area number 703-312-6600, to discuss an Examiner's Amendment or other suggested action for accelerating prosecution and moving the present application to allowance.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims listed above as presently being under consideration in the application are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of such claims is respectfully requested.

To whatever other extent is actually necessary, Applicant respectfully petitions the Commissioner for an extension of time under 37 CFR §1.136.

Please charge any actual deficiency to ATS&K Deposit Account No. 01-2135
(Case No. 648.40709X00).

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "William I. Solomon", written over a horizontal line.

William I. Solomon
Registration No. 28,565
ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP
1300 North Seventeenth Street, Suite 1800
Arlington, Virginia 22209-3873, USA
Telephone 703-312-6600
Facsimile 703-312-6666